

tax credits to lower income working families; indexing of capital gains rates; expansion of the definition of "independent contractor"—and Democrats, including the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT], and the President and his team, deserve credit for that.

But they still aren't good enough. Beyond the pluses and minuses, and the tables showing who gains and who loses, there are fundamental problems with this budget package.

First, it widens the gap between rich and poor in this Nation, when we should be working to increase fairness and narrow the income gap.

Republicans seem to think money made from money is superior to money made from work. Under these bills, working people's salaries will continue to be taxed at existing rates, but rates will be cut on profits from securities or property.

People who earn just enough to get by will get a small break—if they have children—but people who have spare money to put into the new back-loaded IRA's will get all their future interest tax-free. And people leaving large estates will be able to pass on much more without tax.

A Citizens for Tax Justice analysis of the tax bill shows that, among income groups, the lowest 20 percent will actually pay more taxes, while the top 20 percent will get more than 75 percent of the benefits. The top 1 percent alone will get more than 30 percent of the benefits.

In dollar terms, this means that those in the lowest 20 percent will pay \$39 a year more in taxes, while those in the highest 1 percent will get a \$16,000 break. Doesn't sound like tax fairness to me.

My second problem is that the reconciliation package rewards the rich with immediate tax cuts and puts off the tough decisions on spending cuts and entitlement reforms.

The justification for separating this year's reconciliation legislation into two bills seems to be to avoid accusations that Medicare cuts are to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy—to try to fool the American people by not including both in one bill.

But it is a fact that in the current climate of deficit reduction we cannot afford to give anyone tax cuts unless we also cut spending. Yesterday's spending reduction bill is not needed to reform Medicare—it won't—or to make tough specific cuts in spending—it doesn't—but to make room for tax cuts.

The future cuts in appropriations required to reach the goal of a balanced budget by 2002 are not specified, but examples given by our colleagues yesterday and today make it clear how deep they would have to be and how unlikely a future Congress would be to inflict such pain.

Medicare savings are business as usual—cuts in provider payments—and reform is left to a commission.

Medicaid cuts are almost entirely taken from the hospitals that serve large numbers of poor and uninsured people, hospitals that are already reeling from prior cuts and from the changes going on in the health care industry.

But the tax cuts begin kicking in now—the capital gains rate cuts are even retroactive.

My third problem is that these bills threaten to starve our future. Even if all the rosy assumptions are correct, and the economy continues to flourish, and tax losses don't ex-

plode, many necessary investments in our physical and social infrastructure will be unaffordable. I don't believe in term limits, and I hope to be here in 5 years, even in 10 years, but I certainly don't look forward to dealing with the budget situation we will face then because of these bills.

Mr. Speaker, there are highly visible problems with these bills, but I am also worried about the invisible. In the Republicans' unseemly rush to pass something—anything—and go on vacation, few Members have had the time to thoroughly study and understand both bills. Already, there are reports of "rifle shot" tax breaks and other goodies tucked in, in obscure language. Who knows what's in there. By itself, that should be reason enough to delay the conference report until September.

Mr. Speaker, I can count. I know this tax bill will pass as easily as yesterday's spending bill did, and the President will sign both, but you should be aware that Democrats will make every effort in the months and years to come to correct the excesses and restore fairness to our government's taxing and spending policies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me and vote against this regressive bill.

A CENTURY OF DEVOTION

HON. JAMES A. BARCIA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1997

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, a church is more than bricks and mortar. A church serves as the foundation of a community and its construction is a labor of love and caring. For the past 100 years, the congregation of Juniata Baptist Church has been the base of their community. This year on August 10, the Juniata Baptist Church will celebrate 100 years of community growth. For the past century, they not only have grown but have expanded to provide Christian education for their children through the creation of the Juniata Christian School.

In August 1973, Pastor Rick Flanders was called to lead the church. For the past 20 years, under his capable leadership, the church has continued its wonderful heritage of accomplishment. The church's congregation has sizably increased. In the 1990's, under Pastor Flander's guidance, the attendance has averaged over 400 people on Sunday mornings.

The Juniata Baptist Church began with a small group of Christian believers meeting in a log cabin in the early 1890's. In 1897, they completed their first regular church building with timber hewn by men of the congregation. The little assembly was then officially known as the Free Will Baptist Union Church. Early pastors were meagerly supported, but generously given lodging by members of the congregation in their homes. In 1944, the church was finally able to purchase a parsonage.

The Juniata Baptist Church has undergone several remodeling and expansion projects in its century-long existence. In 1951, William Vroman was named their pastor. Under his leadership, the little church building was extensively improved and remodeled. In 1966, after Brother Vroman moved on, the church

called Brother William Goodwin, one of the first graduates of Midwestern Baptist Seminary, as its pastor. Extensive building was done during his pastorate. The parsonage was moved from the north side of Saginaw Road to just south of the church building. A new auditorium was built in 1961, and the educational building, which houses the gymnasium and classrooms, was built in 1986. After Pastor Goodwin moved, the church called Richard Arnold to serve as pastor. He served from 1969 to 1973, during which time attendance grew and the auditorium was expanded. The parsonage was then moved across Washburn Road to make room for the auditorium expansion.

The Juniata Christian School has served members of its congregation and the community by passing along strong Christian values to future generations by maintaining a K through 12 program. In 1972, the day-school ministry began with 25 students in grades K through 3 and today they have increased to serve about 200 students in grades K through 12. The school is dedicated to teaching the Christian principles to students at an early age, so that they will have their faith to guide them through life's many challenges.

Mr. Speaker, the mission of the Juniata Baptist Church has remained consistent throughout all of the structural changes. The Juniata Baptist Church continues to provide an invaluable service to the community, teaching through example. The focus of its ministry has been constant over the years of its history: winning people to Christ and teaching them the Bible. Mr. Speaker, I ask you and the rest of our colleagues to join me in congratulating Pastor Rick Flanders and the dedicated congregation of the Juniata Baptist Church on 100 years of leadership and wish them many more to come.

PAN AM FLIGHT 103: WE WILL NEVER FORGET THE VICTIMS

HON. JON D. FOX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1997

Mr. FOX. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on one of the most important and dangerous challenges America faces as we approach the 21st century: terrorism. Throughout many parts of the world Americans continue to be at risk of a terrorist attack. Sadly, the 1990's brought reality to bear hard down upon us with attacks on our own soil. The bombing of the Federal building in Oklahoma City in 1995 and the World Trade Center in New York City in 1993 are but two terrorists attacks that come to mind.

Last year, the 104th Congress took great strides to combat international terrorism, most notably with our passage of the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 and the enactment of additional sanctions against terrorist states such as Libya and Iran. But it is not enough. The war still continues and American citizens remain at risk. While we must continue to address ways in which to adopt preventative measures, we must not forget or abandon the victims themselves or the surviving families of those who have already suffered and who may still continue to suffer.

Almost 9 years ago Pan Am Flight 103 was destroyed over the quiet countryside of

Lockerbie, Scotland, killing 270 innocent people, including 189 Americans, some of whom were from my own State of Pennsylvania. This was not a tragic accident, but a deliberate act of cold-hearted murder. Two suspected Libyan intelligence agents were charged in 1991 by the United States and United Kingdom as having perpetrated this cowardly deed. Yet for more than 5 years they have remained safely protected by the Libyan Government. Despite the imposition of both U.S. and U.N. sanctions, this impasse has no end in sight.

That is one reason why the victims of the Pan Am 103 bombing are seeking accountability and compensation from the Government of Libya through civil actions here in United States courts. Unbelievably, before we passed legislation in April 1996, the immediate families of the victims were unable to sue in the United States because of Libya's sovereign immunity. Fortunately, we saw fit to change that cruel anomaly. However, Congress did not go far enough to recognize that there are other victims of terrorism besides those who tragically suffered personal injuries or death. In the case of Pan Am 103, thousands of innocent Americans lost their entire livelihood, pensions, benefits, and futures due to the subsequent bankruptcy of Pan American World Airways, an event directly related to the bombing. Yet these victims are not permitted their day in court by laws that only serve to protect the terrorist states.

There is no conceivable reason why a state that descends to the level of committing inhumane acts, such as the bombing of a civilian aircraft, should not be held totally and fully accountable for these intentional atrocities. No one can place a price on the loss of a loved one. But a family's loss of a loved one does not extinguish or diminish the loss another family might have suffered or suffers because of a loss of their livelihood.

That is why I am planning to introduce a bill that will allow any American financially harmed by an act of terrorism sponsored by one of the rogue states on the State Department's terrorism watch list to have their day in court and the opportunity to prove their losses. An American harmed by an intentional act as egregious as terrorism should be provided the opportunity to seek justice and compensation. This bill will send a message to those states who believe they can simply walk away from harming Americans. There is no legitimate reason that excuses our failure to act on this amendment and provide whatever possible legal protection we can. It is not only our political obligation as representatives of the U.S. Government, but it is our moral obligation to the American people we represent.

This proposed measure already has significant bipartisan support. Earlier today we sent to all Members of this House our request to join in this fight against terrorists. I hope that many more of my colleagues will see fit to join in our fight. No American victim of terrorism should ever be left alone to suffer as they do now. We can not, should not and will not stand for that.

H.R. 2015—THE BALANCED BUDGET ACT OF 1997

SPEECH OF

HON. WILLIAM J. COYNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1997

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2015, the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

I am pleased that many of the worst provisions in the House version of this bill have been eliminated or moderated. The changes make it possible for me to support the conference report on this bill. As a result of the unceasing efforts of President Clinton and the Democrats in Congress to make this a better bill, this legislation contains a number of provisions that will benefit millions of Americans.

This legislation will ensure the solvency of the Medicare part A trust fund for the next 10 years, and it creates a commission that will recommend measures to preserve this important program for decades more. H.R. 2015 preserves the Medicare Program primarily by lowering future reimbursement rates for health care providers. The bill also provides several important new prevention benefits to Medicare recipients—including expanded mammography coverage, coverage of prostate and colorectal cancer screenings, and screenings for osteoporosis, and self-management programs for diabetes.

The bill also includes \$24 billion for President Clinton's initiative to provide health insurance coverage for children who currently have no health insurance. This is a major step forward. I believe that this country needs comprehensive health care reform, but in the absence of such reform this measure represents a solid incremental improvement. Some estimates have suggested that up to half of the 10 million children who currently lack health insurance could receive coverage through this initiative.

This bill also takes several important steps to reverse many of the draconian provisions that were included in the so-called welfare reform bill that was enacted in the 104th Congress. Due to the leadership of President Clinton, and at the insistence of the House and Senate Democrats, H.R. 2015 restores SSI and Medicaid benefits for legal immigrants who were receiving them before the welfare reform bill was enacted last year, and it provides SSI benefits for legal immigrants who were in the country at that time and who subsequently became disabled. In addition, the bill eliminated the provision in the House version of this bill that would have excluded welfare recipients in workfare programs from Federal minimum wage and workplace protection laws.

Finally, I would like to point out that the balanced budget package that we will adopt this week has only been made possible by the deficit reduction packages of 1990 and 1993—bills that together reduced deficits by over a trillion dollars. Those were the real budget balancing votes. Those bills raised taxes and cut spending. It was not easy, but it was absolutely necessary to produce a healthy economy and economic growth. The upbeat economic conditions that we are enjoying today are due in no small part to those bills, and the tax breaks provided in this balanced budget

package are the fruits of the seeds that were sown in 1990 and 1993 by Democratic Congresses.

Mr. Speaker, in a letter that the American Association of Retired Persons sent to me earlier today, Mr. Horace B. Deets concluded that "legislation of this scope can never fully satisfy every interested party. But, on balance * * * this conference report * * * will accomplish the objectives of balancing the budget while also protecting access, affordability, quality, and choice in the Medicare Program." I agree with his assessment. Consequently, I intend to vote in support of this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to do so as well.

SUPPORT AWARENESS OF SUICIDE AND EFFORTS TO PREVENT SUICIDE

HON. JOHN LEWIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1997

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a resolution today that recognizes that suicide is a national problem and encourages suicide prevention efforts. I am pleased that more than 20 of my colleagues are joining me in this effort by becoming original cosponsors of this bill.

It is my hope that congressional recognition will encourage people to talk about feelings of despair and suicide. An estimated 750,000 people attempt suicide each year. These attempts are traumatic not only for the individual but also for family and friends who surround him or her.

Suicide claims more than 31,000 lives annually, more than homicide. It is the ninth leading cause of all deaths in the United States and the third for young people aged 15 to 24. It is on the rise for young people in general and for African-American young men in particular.

We must talk about mental illness, and we must encourage treatment. We must tell our friends and our loved ones that it is OK to talk about feelings of despair, hopelessness, and suicide. For those who have the courage to get help, to seek treatment—we must support them. And we must talk about suicide so that we can try to understand it and prevent it.

Too much shame surrounds feelings of depression and suicide. We can change that—and we must—by reaching out to others in our community. This resolution recognizes suicide as a national problem and declares suicide prevention to be a national priority. It also encourages initiatives to prevent suicide and support people who have lost someone to suicide.

The Senate has already passed a similar resolution. It is my hope that the House of Representatives will soon consider this important issue.

HONORING TAIWAN'S
AMBASSADOR

HON. MAURICE D. HINCHEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1997

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, we have seen significant changes in the Far East in the last